A Præfatory DISCOURSE

TO

A late PAMPHLET, *Entituled*,

A

MEMENTO

FOR

English PROTESTANTS, &c.

BEING

An ANSWER to that Part of the *Compendium*, which reflects upon the Bishop of *Lincoln*'s Book.

The Second Edition, with several Additions and Amendments.

TOGETHER

With some Occasional Reflections on Mr. *L'Estrange*'s Writings.

LONDON,

Printed by Tho: Dawks, *for the Author*. 1681.

BIBLIOTHECA·BODLEIANA·

THIS

IS HUMBLY

DEDICATED

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND

FATHER IN GOD

THOMAS

LORD BISHOP

OF

LINCOLN.

THE PREFACE.

THE Papiſts have of late given us ſuch freſh Occaſions by their horrid and damnable Conſpiracies againſt the Perſon of our King, our Government, and our Religion; to renounce and deteſt the Communion of that Church, which does not only allow men, but teaches them to be Murderers and Traytors. And we have yet ſo great Reaſon to apprehend the diſmal Conſequences of their Secret and Helliſh Machinations, that I am confident no Diſcourſe which tends to heighten and improve the juſt Prejudices of *Engliſh men*, againſt that impious and abſurd Religion, will be thought at this time unneceſſary by any good Proteſtant. I ſhall not therefore make any Apology for the Collecting and Printing this Epitome of the three great Maſſacres in *Piedmont*, *France* and *Ireland*, which is intended chiefly for the Inſtruction of ignorant and unlearned People; for we fear not that Scholars and men of Sence ſhould be made Papiſts, except ſuch whoſe Morals are ſo wretchedly debauch'd, that they are ready at all times to ſacrifice their Conſciences to their Civil Intereſts: and I hope there are not ſo many of theſe deſperate Proſtitutes as the Papiſts are apt to imagine, and as the Manners of the Age we live in, may (I confeſs) give us juſt cauſe to fear: No, 'tis the ordinary Rank of men, who have not had the Advantage of Learning and a generous Education, to defend themſelves againſt the ſtudied Fal-

lacies and ſpecious pretences of the *Romiſh* Agents, who commonly become the Prey of thoſe *Wolves in Sheeps cloathing*.

To provide therefore for their Security, that they may not fall into the ſnares that are laid for them, ought to be our chiefeſt Care, ſince as 'tis more Charity to ſtrengthen the hands of the weak, than to add force to the ſtrong; ſo in this caſe, 'tis more prudent too, in order to the ſupport of the common cauſe of Proteſtant Religion, the ignorant being by far the greater number. Nor is this to be done a better way, than by furniſhing them with ſuch plain Arguments as they are able to apprehend and manage themſelves, to the confuſion of the common Enemy. And theſe can be no other than ſuch as are drawn from matters of Fact, they being eaſieſt to be underſtood, and hardeſt to be anſwer'd.

For this Reaſon it was, that this ſhort Narrative of the bloody Butcheries and inhumane Murders heretofore committed upon the perſons of Proteſtants, by *Italian*, *French* and *Iriſh* Papiſts, in cold blood, and by the Inſtigation of their Church, was prepared for the Preſs at the deſire of a worthy Gentleman, (whoſe Zeal for the Intereſt of his Country and the Proteſtant Religion deſerves a publick mention, would his Modeſty permit it) in order to the being by him beſtow'd among his Country Neighbours, who, ſome of them perhaps have never heard of, and others may have forgot the Story of theſe holy Popiſh Cruelties, theſe religious Villanies; the deſign being to let ſuch ſort of People ſee, what a horrid thing Popery is, when her Verniſh is taken off; what a deform'd and frightful face this gaudy painted whore, * *With whom the Kings of the earth have committed Fornication, this Mother of Abominations, made drunk with the blood of the Saints, and with the blood of the Martyrs of Jeſus*; I ſay, What a deform'd and frightful face ſhe has when her Paint is laid by, and ſhe appears by true Lights in her proper Colours: What monſtrous and abominable Actions Papiſts are capable of, when the Intereſt of that Idol of theirs (their Church) requires them. By which as well as by their late Plots here in *England*, 'tis not hard for men of the meaneſt Capacities to perceive, That their Religion cannot be the Religion of Chriſt, while it juſtifies them in the groſſeſt Immoralities, and engages them in the moſt unchriſtian Practices. That thoſe deteſtable Doctrines of *Depoſing and Killing Kings, and extirpating Hereticks*, which have been ſo often objected to the Church of *Rome* by Proteſtant Divines, are not *Speculative Notions and Propoſitions Problematical*,

* *Rev.* 17. 2,5,6.

matical, as ſome of the Popiſh Writers, and particularly the Author of that lying Libel, called * *The Compendium*, would make us believe; But ſuch ſettled Maxims of their barbarous Eccleſiaſtical Policy, as too often have been, and again will be put in practice, whenever that proud uncharitable Church has a ſafe occaſion to do it; though at other times they muſt be diſown'd with the uſual Popiſh Impudence, eſpecially to ſuch Proteſtants as have ſo little wit to take what they ſay on Truſt, or ſo little Reading not to be able to diſprove them.

* *Compend. pag. 77.*

I hope no man will underſtand me here, as if from the bare Actions of Papiſts, and nothing elſe, I argued to the Principles of Popery, and ~~conclude~~ the one from the other; this were bad Charity, and worſe Logick, and one of their own conſtant Topicks in their Writings againſt Proteſtants: 'twere (to ſay the worſt that can be of it) to fall directly into the ridiculous way of Reaſoning uſed by the *Compendianiſt*, when he pretends to anſwer the Bp. of *Lincoln*'s Book, that admirable and learned Diſcourſe; a Diſcourſe of ſo great uſe at this time, and which does with ſuch undeniable Evidence convince the Religion of Papiſts to be guilty of all their traiterous and bloody Deſigns againſt Kings and Proteſtants, that I cannot but take this occaſion to correct that troubleſome Impertinent, who has made ſuch a fenceleſſe Buzze, and rais'd ſuch a duſt about it, with deſign to puzzle and darken thoſe Truths, which the Biſhop has there made ſo plain and clear, eſpecially ſince the Biſhop himſelf has not thought him (as indeed he is not) worthy of his Notice, and no body elſe that I know off, has yet expos'd that part of his impudent Pamphlet, which concerns this truly Venerable and Excellent Perſon.

concluded

First then, what a fooliſh Flouriſh dos he make againſt the Biſhop, endeavouring to throw that wicked Principle of *Depoſing Kings* upon Proteſtants, with this groſſe Fallacy of Arguing from mens Practices to the Principles of their Religion? *Is not his Lordſhips meaning*, ſays * he, *in truth this, that Proteſtant Principles (when really believ'd) are deſtructive to all Kings, eſpecially to Catholick ones? ſince we ſee that the lawful Monarchs of England, Scotland, Sweedland, Denmark, the United Provinces, Tranſylvania, Geneva, &c. have been actually depos'd by their Proteſtant Subjects.* This (&c.) here I gueſſe to be a Lye of the loweſt price in their Book of Rates for Sin; tis ſo pitifull and inconſiderable a trick. He puts it down, as if there were a vaſt and tireſome number of Coun-

* *Compend. pag. 77.*

Swedeland

tries behind, which in kindneſs to his Reader he forbears to mention, where Princes have been depos'd by Proteſtants; when he knew in his Conſcience he could ſcarce have nam'd one more, if it had been to gain the Popedom; if he could, I doubt not but we ſhould have had it at full length. Well; but in thoſe Countries he has nam'd, *Princes (it ſeems) have been actually depoſed by their Proteſtant Subjects.* And what then? Does it therefore follow, that the Proteſtant Religion teaches the Doctrine of Depoſing Kings? Or, may it not indeed teach the quite contrary for all that? Did this wretched Trifler never hear of men who have acted contrary to the Principles of their Religion? where has he liv'd? In a Convent without doubt, among the moſt Seraphick Saints of his Church; - *I mean thoſe mad Fanatickes of the Sect of Abbot *Joachim*, who according to their New *Evangelium Æternum*, have been in a ſtate of Perfection ever ſince the year 1260. I wonder when his hand was in, and while he was induſtriouſly ſtuffing out his thin Diſcourſe with bigge and ſounding words, he did not bring all the Proteſtant Criminals, and other ill men, who have been any way Famous ſince the Reformation, upon the ſtage, and then charge the Proteſtant Religion with Felony, and Murder, and Treaſon, and Adultery, and Perjury, and what not? The Conſequence had been altogether as good, and the Triumph as juſt. We do not reaſon at this looſe and abſurd Rate, when we accuſe the Church of *Rome* of Principles which juſtifie the *Depoſing and Murdering of Princes*, and the Maſſacre of Millions of innocent People, whom with a ridiculous affectation ſhe terms Hereticks. But we firſt prove her (as my Lord Biſhop of *Lincolne* has unanſwerably done) to have ſuch Principles; and this not only from the Books of her moſt eminent Writers, upon whoſe Teſtimony we always lay the leaſt weight) allow'd and commended by her ſelf, but from that Law which is the Rule of Juſtice in her Eccleſiaſtical Courts, from the Authentick Bulls and Decretals of her Popes, and laſtly (which is the greateſt Evidence that is poſſible in the caſe) from the Canons of her general Councils. Then we urge matters of Fact, conformable to them, to ſhew that they are not things of bare Speculation and diſpute among Caſuiſts and Schoolmen, but ſuch neceſſary Rules for ſupport of her Hierarchy, as have been frequently put in practiſe, to the great ſcandal of the Chriſtinn Profeſſion.

* Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Fanaticiſme of the Church of *Rome*, pag. 276.

To come to particulars: We ſhould not lay to her Charge the Mur-

Murders of *Henry* III. and *Henry* IV. of *France*, becauſe they were committed by Members of her Communion, if (beſides the publick Applauſe of the one by the then Pope, in a Set-ſpeech to the Colledg of Cardinals) we had not firſt convinc'd her of holding ſuch Principles as juſtify both. We ſhould not accuſe her of the ſeveral Conſpiracies of Papiſts here in *England* againſt the Lives of Queen *Elizabeth*, King *James*, King *Charles I.* and his preſent Majeſty, if(beſides the proving upon her the before-mention'd Principles) ſhe had not actually and formally (as far as it lay in her Power) Excommunicated and Depos'd them all, and abſolv'd their Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance. We ſhould not accuſe her of the Maſſacres of *Paris* and *Piedmont*, becauſe her Sons were there the *Brethren in Iniquity*, *the Sons of Violence*, that acted unprovok'd thoſe diſmall Slaughters, if, as an additional proof of her holding the before-mention'd Principles, ſhe had not (*a*) commended the one, giving thanks to God for it, and (*b*) commanded the other. Laſtly, we ſhould not place to her Account the late Rebellion of *Ireland*, and all thoſe murders which were the conſequences of it, becauſe the Rebels were Papiſts, it (beſides that the (*c*) Pope's Nuncio was known to be the chief Guid, and *Romiſh* Prieſts the chief Contrivers and Fomenters of that deſperate and bloody Revolt) it were not moſt notorious, that ſhe has alwayes ready an Armory of execrable Principles, ſuited to ſuch occaſions, to ſatisfy the Conſciences and encourage the Madneſs of her *Jewiſh Zealots*.

(*a*) Thuanus *Hiſt.* *l.*53.*p.*837.

(*b*) Hiſtory of the *Waldenſes*.

(*c*) Hiſtory of the *Iriſh* Rebellon, printed 1680.

This I am confident all impartial men will judge fair Dealing and juſt diſcourſe, and far different from the Method of the *Compendianiſt*; the Reader may ſee we ground not our Charge of Popery upon the bare Actions of Papiſts, but having found this degenerate Church teaching the moſt diſloyal and inhumane Doctrines; and then obſerving her followers in ſeveral famous Inſtances, to be guilty of Facts which directly anſwer to them: We think we have reaſon to conclude the one to be the cauſe of the other, and that many Papiſts had not been ſo bad men, if their very Religion had not debauch'd them. May we not now juſtly turn the *Compendianiſt*'s own words of fooliſh Triumph upon himſelf and his Party? **What Parity is there between us and our Adverſaries, either in our Actions or Books of this Nature?* Though the Actions of many Proteſtants have been too bad to be juſtifi'd, yet did they never go to the Church for Sanctuary. Though Proteſtants

* *Compend. pag.* 77.

ſtants have been Depoſers and Murderers of Princes, (there are Rogues of all Perſwaſions;) yet had they never any Encouragement from their Religion ſo to do? nor did any of them ever ſo much as pretend it, except ſuch Bedlam Fanaticks as Fifth Monarchy men, a *Venner*, or a *John of Leyden*: and theſe are (properly ſpeaking) as far from being right Proteſtants, as Papiſts are from being right Chriſtians. But can he ſhew us where the Proteſtant Religion allows the Depoſing or murdering of Princes, or gives the leaſt intimation of ſuch a Power in the Church? Can he ſhew it us, (where only it ought to be look'd after, *viz.*) in the Confeſſions of our Faith, or in the Articles of our Communion? Or, laſtly can he ſhew it us in the Writings of any conſiderable Proteſtant Divines? though their private Opinions unlicenc'd and unauthoriz'd by the Church, of which they are Members, cannot properly be a Charge againſt the Proteſtant Religion, but (becauſe we will give him more than he can juſtly ask in this Controverſie) I ſay, can he ſhew it us, even here? I know indeed he does affirm, *That the* * *Prime Leaders* (as he ſtiles them) *of the Reformation, Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Beza, &c. have in expreſs terms held, That Princes might be depoſed upon the account of Religion.* But he has not quoted one of their Books to direct us where this ſcandalous Tenet, which he fixes upon them, might be found, but leaves us to hunt after it at large among the voluminous Writings of thoſe Authors. I do not therefore think my ſelf oblig'd to take any more notice of this Slander of his, than if he had never vented it. What? does he expect to be believ'd upon his bare word? Upon the honour of a Popiſh Controvertiſt?

* *Compend. pag.* 76.

——*ſic notus Ulixes?*

Does he think we know them no better than to truſt them? But we will not uſe all the Advantages that we have againſt ſo bad a Cauſe, and ſo weak an Adverſary. Let us ſuppoſe then for once, That *Luther, Calvin,* and as many more as he has a mind to take into his, &c. have held, *That Princes may be depos'd upon the Account of Religion:* By what new Logick can he make this pertinent to the preſent Diſcourſe? Does he thinke it the ſame thing to hold indefinitely, *That Princes may be depos'd upon the Account of Religion*; and to hold, *That the Church has a Right to depoſe them upon that Account?* To hold that they may be depoſed by an Authority Civil, and to hold that they may be depos'd by an Authority Eccleſiaſtical? Let him now ſpeak his Conſcience without a Diſpenſation. Does he in good earneſt think theſe two Pro-

Propoſitions equivalent, or at leaſt equivalent as to the point in controverſie between him and the Biſhop of *Lincoln*, and that they equally diſgrace the profeſs'd Religion of him who affirms them. He cannot ſure be ſo void of the ordinary reaſon of a Man, though he has ſwallow'd down never ſo many Roman Catholick Doctrines, as not to perceive a palpable difference between them. 'Tis not but that the former of theſe Poſitions is a very bad Principle, dangerous to Princes, and deſtructive to the Peace and Settlement of a Nation, though not ſo much as the latter, becauſe it wants the Enforcement of Conſcience and Religion to fix it in the Mind, and thruſt it out upon occaſion into action with that Violence, which uſually accompanies a pretended Zeal for the Honour of God. But how bad ſoever it may be, ſtill 'tis a Civil, not a Religious Principle; and though it may be Sedition in the higheſt degree, it can never be Hereſie; a mans Life and Eſtate (who maintaines it) is anſwerable for it, not his Religion. To make this a little clearer, I ſay, 'Tis one thing to hold, That Princes may be depos'd by the State, though upon the Account of Religion, (*i. e.* for being of a Religion different from the eſtabliſh'd) grounding this Opinion upon the Laws and Cuſtoms of ſome particular Civil Conſtitutions, or upon the ends of Government in general; and quite another thing to hold, that they may be depos'd by the Church, grounding this Opinion upon the Laws of Religion, and a Power ſuppos'd to be delegated to her by Chriſt. This laſt is the Principle we charge, and the Biſhop of *Lincoln* has prov'd upon the Church of *Rome*, which makes her Religion it ſelf dangerous to Princes. On the other ſide, though *Luther*, *Calvin*, or any other Proteſtant Divines ſhould hold the firſt, though it be a falſe and a bad, yet (as I ſaid before) 'tis a Civil Principle, and their holding it could no more reflect on the Proteſtant Religion, than an Error they might be guilty of in Hiſtory or Mathematicks. The Proteſtant Religion therefore remaines clear from any ſuſpicion of allowing the Doctrine of *Depoſing Princes* (the point I undertook to make good) though it ſhould be granted the *Compendianiſt*, that *Luther* and *Calvin*, &c. have had ill Principles in Relation to Civil Governments. If he could prove indeed, That *Luther* and *Calvin* or any other Proteſtant Divines have held *The Lawfulneſs of Depoſing Princes*, as a Principle of their Religion, and plac'd the power of doing it in the Church, he would ſay ſomething that were to the purpoſe, and parallel to what we accuſe the Church of *Rome* off, but in the Method he has taken, he does but beat the Air, and fight with Shadows.

I shall explain this Distinction a little further by some famous Examples, in order to meet with the other Cavils of this idle wrangler, and make the Inconsequence of his Arguings (if it be possible) yet more apparent. He may remember then, That here in *England*, *Edward* the II. and *Richard* the II. were *actually* depos'd in times of Popery, and by Papists; yet did our Writers never charge the Church of *Rome*, (though she held then the same doctrines, and had the same Pride to trample on Princes that now she has) with those two disloyal and unjust Usurpations upon the Sovereignty of the Kings of *England*. And for what imaginable reason but this only, *viz.* because they were both acts of the Civil Power, and carried on by men who grounded what they did upon Principles (though grosly false and mistaken) drawn from the Constitution of the *English* Government, and the Rights of the two Houses of Parliament; and the Church of *Rome*, contrary to her Custom upon such occasions, was only a bare Spectator, neither her Authority nor her Principles being made use of to further or justifie those proceedings. I would now ask this Collector of Impertinences, this teadious *Compendianist*, whether he thinkes this a good reason to clear the Church of *Rome* from being concern'd in the deposing of these two unfortunate Princes. If he sayes, Tis, as no doubt he will, with what face can he pretend to charge the Church of *England*, (as he would be understood to do, *pag.* 76 *lin.* 38.) with the Endeavours that were us'd to keep Queen *Mary* from the Crown, the Death of the Queen of *Scots*, and the Bill of the late House of Commons against the Duke of *York*'s succession, since the Cases are directly parellel; I mean parallel in all that concernes the present Question. Were they not every one of them Acts of the Civil Power, and carried on by men who grounded what they did on Civil, not Religious Principles; Was not the setting up of the Lady *Jane Grey*, and the raising an Army to oppose Queen *Mary*, an Act of the Privy Council in pursuance of King *Edward*'s Will, and a Law made in the Reign of *Henry* the VIII. for the Illegitimating of this Princess, as the Lords of the Council themselves declare in their Answer to her Letter writ from * *Framingham Castle*? Was not the Death of the Queen of *Scots* most notoriously an act of the State, and justified by the Laws of the Land? Was she not indicted for Treason, and known to pretend a better Title to the Crown than Queen *Elizabeth*? Lastly, was not the Bill against the Duke of *York* grounded on a suppos'd Legal Power in the King and the Two Houses, to alter the Course of the Succession when they think fit?

* *Bakers Chron.*

Have

Have not all the Pamphlets that have been writ in Vindication of that Bill argued the Lawfulneſſe of it from the Conſtitution of the Civil Government, and wholly diſclaim'd the Intereſting of Religion at all in the buſineſſe, as to the juſtifying of it in the leaſt degree, endeavouring with great paines to prove, That true Religion does not meddle with the Civil Rights of Princes, but leaves them to be determin'd by the Laws and Cuſtoms of particular Countries? By what ſtrange conſequence then can he entitle the Church of *England*, or the Proteſtant Religion, to things that are ſo perfectly of a Civil nature, unleſs he will make them anſwerable for all the Actions of Proteſtants of what kind ſoever, and reſolve to maintaine that childiſh *Sophiſme* I firſt took notice of, as the chief ground of all his extravagant Raving againſt the Biſhops Book, *viz. The concluding the Principles of a Religion from the Practices of her Profeſſors?* Which is the very Dregs of Folly, the laſt Running of Impertinence.

'Tis true, the Proteſtant Religion (*i. e.* the care of preſerving it) was, no doubt, the great Motive of doing what was done in every one of theſe three Caſes, but that is not here to the purpoſe; for, 'tis not the Reaſon for which, but the Authority by which, a Prince is depos'd, and the kind of Principle (*i.e.* whether Civil, or Religious) 'tis juſtifi'd upon, that muſt condemn, or acquit a Church of the Guilt of it; though this man endeavour all along to inſinuate the contrary, by ſuch a fallacious way of repreſenting the Poſition charg'd on the Church of *Rome*, as makes that ſeem to be the chief Point in the Controverſy between her and the Biſhop of *Lincoln*, which is in truth no part of it, *viz.* the *Motive or end of depoſing Princes.* But 'tis not the Buſineſſe of this little Pamphleter to ſtate things fairly, and reaſon clearly, but to amuſe the Reader, and puzzle the Queſtion; a cloſe way of arguing will not ſuit either with his Cauſe or his Underſtanding: a good proof of which he gives us at the very firſt, in theſe words; * *If on the other-ſide* (ſayes he) *the Biſhop means that there have been Popiſh Doctors of the Opinion, That Princes might be Depos'd upon the account of Religion, what Advantage, I would fain know, can that be to his Lordſhip, or his Treatiſe, ſince not only all the Prime Leaders of the Reformation, &c.* Is it to be imagin'd now, that a man ſhould get ſo far out of his way, unleſs he purpoſely deſign'd to ramble, or write things ſo groſſly impertinent to the matter he was treating of; unleſs he ſtudyed to confound it, and render it as little intelligible as was poſſible? This is properly playing at Croſs Purpoſes (which he very fooliſhly, and very unjuſtly accuſes the Biſhop off) when men talk

* *See the* Compend. *pag.* 76.

what is foreign to the Queſtion and wander from the buſineſs out of deſigne. Never did any man take more true pains to underſtand a Diſcourſe difficult in it ſelf, than he has done to miſunderſtand the Biſhop's, which was plain and eaſy, or at leaſt to make his Reader do ſoe; for he cannot be ſoe dull himſelf in this point as he would ſeem. 'Tis not poſſible that he, or any man who has read the Biſhop's Book, ſhould think, it was the Biſhop's meaning only to charge the popiſh Doctors with holding indefinitely, *That Princes might be Depos'd upon the account of Religion*, when 'tis ſo palpably evident in a hundred places of his Book, that he only brings their Opinions as a collateral proof of his Charge of their Church and Religion, and that with a quite different Tenet, as I have already ſhow'd. And as 'tis the *Roman Church*, and not the Doctors, only, or chiefly, which the Biſhop charges with holding, *that Princes may be Depos'd by her Authority, not with holding indefinitely that they may be Depos'd upon the account of Religion:* So 'tis the preſent popiſh Canon-Law, the Bulls and Decretals of Popes, and the Canons of General Councils, which are the Teſtimonies he relies upon for the making good of his Charge, and not the private Opinions of Popiſh Doctors, though being cited out of Books licens'd and approv'd by that Church, they are of conſiderable weight in the Argument. Now what ſayes the *Compendianiſt* to theſe ſtrong and moſt convincing Proofs? *Why in fine (as Mr.* Bayes *ſayes upon another occaſion) he wont tell us.* He has not one word, not one Syllable of Anſwer to them, but paſſes them over with as deep a ſilence, and as good a grace, as if they were, like moſt of his own, not at all to the purpoſe. This diſcreet and neceſſary Reſolution being taken, he bends all his little Wit, and with a great deal of Chearfulneſſe goes about to invalidate what the Biſhop urges from the Writings of the Popiſh Doctors, which yet the poor impotent Scribler is by no means able to do; as I have made appear in my Anſwer to his Charge of *Luther* and *Calvin*. The Attempt however was juſt as wiſe, and as likely to ſatisfy reaſonable men, as if a General, who had a great and well diſciplin'd Army to fight with, ſhould neglect the Main Body, and with his whole ſtrength ſet upon the Forlorn Hope.

Before I proceed any farther, I cannot but take Notice of a very extraordinary Paſſage, which I meet with, pag. 77. li. 12. Where the Compendianiſt would make the World believe, That we our ſelves confeſs, That our Monarchy is weaken'd by our Religion; That Popery

pery must be call'd back to support it, and that Papists are hated by many on this Account, all which is in it selfe so notorious a Falsehood, and in him (who could not but know the contrary) so base a Slander of the Protestant Faith in general, and of the People of *England* in particular, that I am confident no true Protestant can read it without Indignation, nor any sensible man without Astonishment at the strange Impudence of this prostitute Writer. His Words are these: *Can it be said, That the Monarchy has gotten by the Reformation, when Protestants themselves acknowledge (and what desperate Enemies that has created us, may be easily imagin'd) that nothing but Popery, or at least its Principles, can make it again emerge, or lasting?* Was there ever such a complication of Malice and Folly as this Period affords us? There is a veine of impertinent arguing, contrary to the known Rules of Discourse, and shameless affirming, contrary to the knowne Truth of Fact, which runs through the whole Masse of his crude and indigested Pamphlet: But this is a Nompareillo (to use *Bayse's* Phrase) of want of Modesty, and want of Sence, one of his bold Strokes. 'Tis usual with him to tell Tales for Arguments, and lay down confident Assertions in stead of Proofs: but let him now rake together all the Dirt he can meet with, and practise himself in Compendiums, *i. e.* in lamentable ill reason'd, lying Discourses; Let him make Extracts of the Lives of popish Saints, and abridge the Legends of Monks; let him take short Heads of Mr. *Cressy's Mystical Divinity* in his *Sancta Sophia*, and write Epitomes of the Controversies of the Schoolmen, he shall never again be able to crowd so much Nonsence, Libel, and Untruth into so few Words, as long as he lives. (*Can it be said* (sayes he) *That the Monarchy has gotten by the Reformation*, &c?) Prodigious Impudence! Can any thing elfe be said with the least colour of Reason, or Truth? He cannot but know too, that this has alwayes been said by Protestant Writers, and prov'd beyond all contradiction, except that of absurd and illogical men, from whom Saint *Paul* pray'd to be delivered. However since he will needs make a New Question of it, I shall take this occasion to inform the ignorant Reader (for none else can need it) how much the Monarchy has gotten by the Reformation in point of Civil Advantage, and consequently, how great a Loser it will be every way, if by some fatal Infatuation, any Successor of his Majesty should again bring the Crown, and the Nation under the Romish Yoke, that worse than Ægyptian Darkness, and

In

Slavery, which neither our Fathers, nor We are able to beare.

In the first place the, The Monarchy has by the Reformation, gotten an absolute Freedom from the Tyranny of the Popes Spiritual Supremacy, and his pretended Temporal Power *in ordine ad Spiritualia*, to which it was before subject, and in pursuance of which several of our Kings have been summon'd to appear personally at *Rome*, and King *John* forc'd to resigne his Crowne to a Legate, to the high Dishonour of the Regal Majesty, and the apparent Prejudice of that Reverence it ought to have in the mindes of the People: Nay further, all that Part of the Pope's Spiritual Power, which was either Necessary, or useful for the Government of the Church, is, by the Reformation, become the King's, so that no Authority but God Almighty's is now above him, nor any in *England* independent of him. He is equally Head both of the Church & the State: No Appeales can be made from his Courts, nor any sort of Persons priviledg'd from his Justice; In a word, He is no longer a Feauditary Vassall to the Popes, as in effect all Popish Princes are; since the Pope has an allow'd Right to command them in whatever he will call Spirituall, or will say has any relation to Spiritual Matters, and by declaring them Hereticks, he can (according to the Romish Religion) depose them, and destroy them when he pleases. Now the being deliver'd from such a low, unworthy Servitude, and the acquiring such a large Increase both of Honour, and Power is certainly no small addition to the Monarchy, yet this it has gotten purely by the Reformation.

Secondly, The Monarchy has by the Reformation gotten a greater Security than it had before, both for the King's Person, and his Crowne; those Hellish Papal Doctrines, which I have been hitherto discoursing off, did, in times of Popery, perpetually hang over their Heads, like *Damocles's* Sword, ready to doe Execution upon the least irregular Motion, and they were neither of them any longer safe than the Pope pleas'd. But since the Reformation, the Popes Excommunications, and Bulls of Deposition are of no Force, and can have little effect in *England*; some they will have while Papists are suffered to live among us, and, by enjoying Estates, to have an Interest in the Kingdom, as the present popish P L O T does but too plainly prove, however by many degrees less than if Popery were again

again the eſtabliſh'd Religion; ſo that I ſay, The King of *England* has by meanes of the Proteſtant Religion, at leaſt a greater Security for his Life, and his Crown, than he had before, an abſolute one he muſt not expect while he has any popiſh Subjects.

Thirdly, The Monarchy has by the Reformation gotten to the King of *England*, the Government of all Engliſh men, of what Order or Profeſſion ſoever, which heretofore he had not, the Clergy being exempt from the Civil Juriſdiction, and depending chiefly on the Pope(who beſtow'd moſt of the Biſhopricks,and great Benefices) both for Protection and Preferment: the King had little power either to puniſh or reward them, as the Hiſtoryes and Records of thoſe times do ſufficiently demonſtrate. But 'tis notoriouſly knowne to what a degree the Reformation has alter'd the ſtate of things in that point, and how much the Intereſts of Clergy men do now tye them, more than others, to the Service of the Crowne, as alſo how well they underſtand, and how zealouſly they purſue thoſe Intereſts, whenas heretofore they were the conſtant Raiſers of Factions againſt their Princes, in favour of *Rome*, and obſtinate maintainers of the Pope's Encroachments upon their Regal Rights. Nay, the Laity themſelves were the Pope's Subjects in Spiritual matters,and for the moſt Part, wholely guided by their Prieſts, the Pope's Dependants (by Reaſon of the great command they had over their Conſciences) in their Civil concernes alſo; Soe that the King under theſe and other circumſtances of Popery was but a Servant to the Church, and little more in Effect than the Popes Vice-Roy. But the Reformation has freed both him, and his people from this baſe, diſhonorable Subjection, aud moſt inconvenient Dependance on a foreign Power.

Theſe are things which all the World muſt acknowledge to be very conſiderable in themſelves, and very great acquiſitions to the Monarchy, yet are they ſuch as have naturally, and neceſſarily fallen into it upon the eſtabliſhment of Proteſtant Religion in the room of Popery, and that too, as 'tis this particular form of Government call'd a Monarchy, diſtinguiſh'd from all other Kindes; if I ſhould take notice of the Advantages it has receiv'd by this change, as 'tis a Civil Government,in general,I might obſerve many more; as firſt,

on

an Increaſe of the Trade, and conſequently of the Riches, of the Kingdom, as well by the taking away that vaſt number of unneceſſary, ſenceleſſe Holydaies, impos'd on the People by the Church of *Rome*, which muſt needs be a great hinderance to the carrying on of publick Buſineſs, and Commerce, as by the application of many Thouſands of Perſons to the waies, and means of raiſing a Fortune to maintain themſelves, who were heretofore maintain'd, and liv'd wholely, like idle Drones, upon the labour and induſtry of others, and by being ſhut up in a Cloyſter, and ſequeſtred from the common Employments of other men, were made every way uſeleſs Members of the State, and a burden to it. Secondly, Another advantage the Monarchy (conſider'd in the general as a body Politick) has receiv'd by this Change, is an Increaſe of the Strength, and Safety of the Kingdom, by the great Increaſe of People (which alſo alwayes increaſes Trade) ſince the Clergy have been allow'd to marry, and the Folly of Monkery and Vowes of pepetual Cælibacy (as they call it) in either Sex has been both forbidden and ſcorn'd.

'Twere eaſy for me to enlarge upo this Argument, and further ſhew, how friendly an Inſtitution, and how highly ſerviceable the Proteſtant Religion, when rightly underſtood, is to the Civil Intereſts, both of this and all other Kingdomes and States as well by the great gentleneſs, and moderation of her external Diſcipline; as by the peaceable temper, and Loyalty of her Doctrines: And that on the other ſide Popery does not only make the Prince himſelf a Dependant, and unſafe, but his people few, ignorant and poor; She robbes him firſt of his Authority, and then of his Subjects; her Monaſteries decoy the zealous, her Inquiſitions drives away the wiſe, and both together enſlave and beggar the fooliſh *Iſſachars*, that ſtay behind, *to bow down their ſervile ſhoulders to the Burden* of an oppreſſive Government. But I think what I have already diſcours'd is more than enough to prove the preſent Point, *viz. That the Monarchy of England has gotten by the Reformation*, and that no body, but a man, who either underſtands not, or cares not what he ſayes, would affirm the contrary.

The Compendianiſt, poſſibly, may here object, as he ſeemes to do, *pag.* 77. *&c.* 9. That popiſh Princes abroad are not ſenſible of theſe Inconveniences in their Religion, nor do they perceive any

any such ill Consequences to arise from the Profession of it, as the Bishop of *Lincoln*'s Book, and this Preface charges it with, but altogether the contrary; *For, Who* (sayes He) *find themselves so flourishing, and great as they?* I suppose he speaks this of the French King (for I know no other popish Prince that is at present, either flourishing, or great) and if he means that Popery has been the cause of his Greatness, I shall not dispute it with him, but this, I will affirme, and maintaine against all the World, That 'twas neither his owne Popery, nor that of his Subjects; though every Body knows the French Popery is much gentler, and more converseable sort of thing than the Spanish, or Italian: more plyant, and submissive to the Civil Magistrate, and more hospitable to Strangers, and Dissenters, and consequently lesse prejudicial to the growth of Power, and the greatness of a State than the other. The Priviledges of the *Gallican* Church, and the Doctrines of the *Sorbonne*, together with the manners of the people, and the Exclusion of the Inquisition, have a little qualified this pernicious Imposture; and temper'd the Malignity of her Influence; as the most destructive Plants do sometimes lose the Virulence of their poisons by a change of Soyle, and *Mercury* it selfe, by a mixture of Ingredients, is rendred Innocent Physick. I grant therefore that Popery in some places, and under some Circumstances of alloy, may not absolutely hinder, but it can never be the cause, nor of it self, in any degree contribute to, the prosperity of either Prince, or people; for 'tis plaine, That the Principles it teaches, and the Consequences it draws after it, do evidently tend (as I have already made appear) to the lessening of the one, and the impoverishing of the other, indeed to the ruine of both; and if Popery have not at all times, and in all Places so bad an effect, it must be attributed to some such causes as I have now mention'd, which do in *France*, serve to take out the sting of this monstrous beast, this Spawn of *the Old Serpent*, and prevent the Mischiefe, which it is otherwise so apt to doe, the Blast it would infallibly bring upon the ordinary fruites of good Government, and the common ends of Civil Societies. To conclude this point, if any Prince or State happen (by some favorable conjuncture, and fortunate Accidents) to be great with, or, rather notwithstanding, Popery, there is no doubt but they would be either of them, much greater without it.

'Tis now left to the Reader to judge, upon a due consideration of the Whole, what an excellent Engine this Popery would prove to buoy up a sinking Monarchy, and make it again *emerge* (as the Compendianist calls it in his pedantical *Latin* phrase) were ours in that desperate low condition to need it, which I hope 'tis far from, or, if it do at present decline, I am sure no man in his right wits, except this Author, will say, 'tis for want of Popery. What kind of men are those Protestants then, who (if we may take the Compendianist's own word for it) would recommend to his Majesty, in a case of extremity, this dry antiquated Drugge, this useless Lump of Formality, and Foppery, this discover'd Cheat, this Insulter and Braver of Crown'd Heads, this Usurper upon the Rights of Princes, this Enemy to *God's Annointed*. I say what kind of Creatures must these be? They are certainly a Species by themselves, and have not the same common Faculties, and wayes of understanding with other Christian people; if at least there be any such, which I will not be overpositive in, upon the Authority of this Writer; for some of his stories are as unlikely (to use his own words about the Plot) *as any Romance Extant*. But Protestants does he term them? It is impossible! Why will he abuse his Friends at this Rate, and call them out of their Names? I'll warrant them they are as good Catholicks as himself. Does he indeed thinke to put this upon us, that Protestants are for the bringing in Popery? He may as well hope to make us believe Transubstantiation it self, 'tis a Contradiction in Terms, an errant Bull. However, upon this occasion, I cannot but reflect that I have sometimes met with a sort of ridiculous Animals, commonly call'd Protestants indeed, whose Heads are giddy, and whose Brains turn round with the Notion of a Catholicke Church, and a visible succession of Bishops ever since the Apostles, Who run stark mad in love with reverend Words, holy Places, consecrated Habits, and godly Gestures, who have abundance of odde, superstitious Zeale, with not one grain of true sence, Disciples of *Heylin*, and *Thornedike*, in a word, a kinde of *L'Estrange* Protestants, men who have listed themselves in our Service, and rank'd on our side only to betray our cause, and give our Enemies the Victory. They seem to have no other designe in the Church of *England* than *Sampson* had in the *Philistines* Temple, *viz.* to pull it downe upon our Heads, and bury us in the Ruines. Now what discourse these

sort

ſort of men have had with the Compendianiſt, I cannot tell, nor am much concern'd, I will not diſpute, but that 'tis poſſible, they may have acknowledg'd ſome ſuch thing as he affirms, for their Politicks are much of a pitch with their Divinity, and I know they will ſay, or confeſs any thing, that tends to undermine, and weaken the Proteſtant Faith, and Intereſt, though it be never ſo fooliſh, and abſurd. Yet do they take it hainouſly ill to be thought Papiſts, and particularly Mr. *L'Eſtrange* ſeems more than ordinarily diſturb'd, when he finds himſelfe charg'd with this Imputation; how does he fling, and flounce in his late Pamphlets, like a gaull'd Hackney, who can neither bear the whipp, nor mend his dull Dog-Trot. But let him beſtow the foamings of his Rage never ſo faſt among the Rabble, and in haſty, uncorrect Libells throw about the empty Froth of his Anger; Let him fret himſelf never ſo lean, and talk like a mad man in the overboylings of his Paſſion; Let him make never ſo many profeſſions of a Proteſtant Faith, and never ſo many Good-Morrows to the Church of *England*, we ſhall ſtill believe him a Papiſt, while he ſoe notoriouſly promotes the Deſignes, and ſerves the Intereſts of that Party. I think nothing is plainer than that the great Endeavour of the Papiſts, ever ſince the Diſcovery of the Plot, has been by all kinde of means, and artifices, to turn off the Publick *Odium* (under which they have ſo juſtly ſuffer'd) as much as was poſſible, from Themſelves upon the Fanaticks, and to ſtir up an ignorant, outragious clamour againſt them; the *Presbyterian* Plot found in the *Meal Tub*, and all the late Pamplets, and diſcourſes of the popiſh Agents, are, but ſo many continued, and undeniable Proofs of this. Now were *L'Eſtrange* their Penſioner (as 'tis not improbable but he is) and as much ingag'd in their Service as *Nevil-Payne*; he could not have more effectually aſſiſted them in the carrying on of this baſe and Villanous Project than he has along done. How earneſtly has he labor'd to revive the Memory of Fox-ton, in contempt of the *Act of Oblivion*, and terrifi'd the people with groundleſſe Apprehenſions of a new Fanatick Warr? How conſtantly has he patch'd up his looſe Diſcouſes with unſeaſonable thread-bare Comments on the Diſorders of the late times, and colour'd his malicious enmity to the Liberties of *England* with violent Invectives againſt *Fanaticks*? Their Defamation has been the chief aime of all his Writings ſince the Plot, the Burden of his overflow-

ing Impertinence, and the Common-place Topick of his Railing. Now let us ſuppoſe the Fanaticks as errant Devils as this Inquiſition-man has a mind to paint them, yet what have they done of late, what new provocation have they given ſince his Majeſties Reſtauration, nay ſince the PLOT, (I meane the Fanaticks of *England*,) that we ſhould thus fall upon them Pell Mell, without either Fear or wit, Ruime or Reaſon. I ſay, what is the matter, That juſt after the Diſcovery, and in the midſt of the Examination of a Horrid Popiſh PLOT, we ſhould all of a ſuddain be hounded on Fanatickes? There is ſure ſome Myſtery in this. Alas! The Artifice is evident and groſſe. Who ſees not that the Deſigne of it is, to ſave the Papiſts from the growing Rage of the Peoples Hate, with which their whole Faction was almoſt run downe, and brought to a Bay, by ſtarting, and inviting their Proſecutors to freſh Game? This, it ſeems, is the Under-PLOT to their great Tragedy, and Mr. *L'Eſtrange*, next to ſome Provincial Jeſuite, the chief Manager.

should be. Can there be any Doubt then, however he appear a Proteſtant, in ſhew and Profeſſion, but that he is a PAPIST, either in Principle or Intereſt, if not in both: and theſe Intereſt-Papiſts are the moſt dangerous of all. For his Panegyricks of the Religion eſtabliſh'd, and his high Expreſſions of Zeale for it, with which at every turne, he flouriſhes his Miſchievous Pamphlets, and guilds the poyſon he would have the People Swallow, they are like the Complement of *Judas* when he betray'd his Maſter, and like the Courteſie of *Joab* when he murder'd *Abner*. But, God be thank'd, Proteſtants now know him too well, to believe in his Flatery, or be wheadled to their Ruine by his ſoft Words. His Writings have diſcover'd ſoe palpable an ill-Will to the true Intereſt of the Proteſtant Cauſe, and the Conſtitution of the Government (for they are at preſent both wound up in the ſame Bottom) and he has purſu'd his Malice with ſo reſtleſſe a diligence, and ſo furious a Zeal, that he's grown a **Common Nuſance** to all good Engliſhmen, and ripe for Correction.

true.

should be

I doubt not therefore (beſides what he may expect from a Parliament) but ſome new *Marvell* will riſe, to bridle the Intemperance of his Mercenary Pen, and put his poor proſtitute wit out of countenance, an Adverſary, who ſhall baffle him more notoriouſly than Mr. *Bagſhaw*, and perſecute him worſe than my Lady *Boltinglaſſe*, who

ſhall

ſhall cruſh his little Plauſibilities with a Maſterly Reaſon, and ſhame him into ſilence by the Juſtneſſe of his Satyre. I ſhall leave him then to the Fate of *Bayes*, which he cannot long eſcape, and to the ſevere Reprimands of his own Conſcience. that full confutation of all his Works, and that only one too which he wants confidence to reply to, and begging the Reader's pardon for this long (but perhaps uſeful) Digreſſion, returne to the Compendianiſt. And, as to what concernes the preſent Argument between him and me, I queſtion not, but upon an impartial weighing of what is here offer'd, it will appear to every reaſonable man, That nothing is more perfectly oppoſite to our Civil, as well as Religious Intereſts than Popery, that nothing could be more prejudicial to the Monarchy, nor more fatal to the proſperity of *England*, than if, after having with ſoe juſt abhorrence ſpew'd up that filthy Load of Superſtition, and Idolatry, with which ſhe was ſo long oppreſs'd, ſhe ſhould be forc'd, either by conqueſt from abroad, or by a Popiſh Succeſſion at home, to returne once more like the *Dog to his Vomit*, or like *the Sow when ſhe has been waſh'd to her wallowing in the Mire.*

For his Objections of the Proteſtant Rebellion in *Hungary*, the late Riſing in *Scotland*, the Murder of the Archbiſhop of Saint *Andrews*, and that *Home-Blow* of his, the *Gazette Advertiſement* of **The Tryall of twenty nine Protestant Regicides**, they are of the ſame nature, and grounded on the ſame pitiful Fallacy with thoſe I have already anſwer'd; and when he can ſhew us any Principle of the *Proſtant Religion* that juſtifies *Rebellion* or *Murder*, eſpecially that of Princes, or does but in the remoteſt degree encourage men to commit thoſe Deteſtable Crimes, I ſhall again conſider them: In the mean time, let him not waſte his Paper, and tire his Reader with the Repetition of ſuch fulſome Sophiſtry.

But perhaps it may not be amiſſe to give a more particular Anſwer to his *Home-blow*, becauſe he has ſuch an opinion of its force, and does ſo triumph with the conceit of his Victory: I ſhall endeavour therefore to take him down in the height of his Rapture, and ſhame his ignorant Malice. The *Reader* will remember the Point

Point he ſhould prove, is, *That Proteſtant Principles are deſtructive to Kings*; for thoſe are the very words of the Introduction to his terrible Argument of *Inſtances of Fact*. Now did the *Twenty nine Proteſtant Regicides* ever pretend to juſtifie their abominable Villany by any Principle of their Religion? Nay, did they not pretend the quite contrary, and ground it wholly upon a Civil Authority? Did they not argue the lawfulneſſe and juſtice of it from a Power they fancied in the People, to call the King to an Account for his Actions? Though in this they were as abſurd Logicians as the *Compendianiſt* has all along ſhew'd himſelf, and reaſon'd not only againſt the very firſt Principle of Civil Policy; but point blank contrary to the moſt fundamental *Maxims* of the Law of *England*, which ſays, *That the King can do no wrong*; and therefore makes his Miniſters queſtionable for the miſcarriages in Government, becauſe he himſelf is in his own Perſon, inviolable and ſacred: but this concerns not the preſent buſineſſe. Theſe men, I ſay, (as bad as they were) had not the impudence to intereſt the *Proteſtant Religion*, or any *Proteſtant Church* whatever, in the guilt of their impious Treaſon, by pretending to derive any Warrant or Encouragement for it from them; or if they had, it would have ſignified nothing to the *Compendianiſt*'s purpoſe, ſince there is no *King-Depoſing*, or *King-Killing* Principle to be found in any Proteſtant *Confeſſions of Faith*, or *Articles of Communion*, (which are the only proper Evidences to convince a *Proteſtant Church* of any Principle or Doctrine that is laid to her Charge) and ſo it would have amounted to no more than their particular miſtaking or perverting the Principles of their Religion, as groſly and as wilfully as they did the Laws of their Country. But this is not the Caſe; for they did not ſo much as pretend any Warrant from the *Proteſtant Religion* for what they did:

Here ſhould be no Section

How then can He charge *Proteſtant Principles* with the *Perſonal Crimes* of theſe men? Or what does his *Home-Blow*, and all his other Inſtances prove, except this only, *viz.* That ſeveral *Proteſtants* have been *Rogues, very great Rogues, Murderers, Rebels, Traytors, &c.* Does He not know that they are all mortal men too, and ſubject to many other Vices, which he might very clearly have prov'd upon them (if he he had pleas'd) by undeniable Examples? There's not a Sin the *Pope* pardons, of what Price ſoever, but 'tis

too

too ſadly true, that *Proteſtants* have been guilty of it at ſome time or other, if that will do him any ſervice. But now in the name of a little common ſenſe, Who, or what does this *Raver* oppoſe in this ſtrenuous Argument? Did ever any of our Writers aſſert that all the *Proteſtants* in the World were good Men, and pious Chriſtians? Or is there any ſort of people among us beſides Quakers, *i. e.* mad men, who hold a ſtate of Abſolute Perfection in this Life? He has put himſelf into an extraordinary Heat, and made ſtrange violent Aſſaults, and yet no Enemy appears near him. What ayles the man? he has ſure been combating ſome Giant in imagination, like *Don Quixote* when he hack'd down the Walls of his Chamber. Well, whoever he be, though it were *Malambruno* himſelf, I'l warrant him he's kill'd outright, this *La Mancha* has ſo laid about him with *Home-Blows.*

Another great quarrel he has to the Biſhop is, that he does not anſwer four Books (nam'd in the *Compendium*'s margin) writ (it ſeems) *by the Catholicks of* England *ſince the Kings Reſtoration,* about *the Depoſing Power of the Church*; * *His Lordſhip* (ſays he) *is ſo far from anſwering theſe Authors, that he never ſo much as cites them to this purpoſe,* (a great fault indeed) *ſo that we muſt conclude them unanſwerable.* Well argued o' my word; I ſee he deals in nothing but *Home-Blows.* Mr. *Bayes* and this *Compendianiſt* would have made a couple of rare Diſputants, if they had not been ſpoil'd by their Tutors, and ill-grounded at firſt; they have both an admirable natural talent at *Reaſoning*, all the difference between them is, *Bayes* loved it in Rhime, and this man's altogether for it in Proſe. But without Raillery, does he believe the Biſhop of *Lincoln* oblig'd to take particular notice of every idle Pamphlet of theirs, that keeps a Pudder about *the Depoſing Power of the Church*, (with deſign to make the buſineſs intricate and dark) and to think them as conſiderable, as his Party always do their own Books? No doubt he takes it monſtrous ill too, that the Biſhop has not thought him worth his Anſwering, and perhaps concludes himſelf unanſwerable. But I hope I ſhall hinder him from falling into that miſtake, and make him ſenſible what an *Impar Congreſſus Achilli*, what a poor contemptible thing he is, when he appears in the Liſts againſt ſo great

* Compend. pag. 78.

a

a Scholar as the Biſhop of *Lincoln*. For the Pamphlets he mentions, they are more than anſwered, in the Biſhops Book, though it does not particularly name them; and when he, or any other *Factor for Popery*, gives a tolerable Anſwer to thoſe clear Teſtimonies I told him of before, (*and which he never ſo much as cites to this purpoſe*) by which the Biſhop does ſo plainly prove the Doctrine of *Depoſing Kings* upon the Church of *Rome*, I here engage my word to him, theſe Pamphlets ſhall be made ridiculous by name, and their Authors ſhew'd to the people in the Fools Coat they deſerve.

In the next place he tells us, * *That the Venetians have openly in their very Writings denied this Depoſing Power of the Church without Cenſure*: And, *That ſeveral Authors have been cenſur'd in* France *and elſewhere for writing for it.* In anſwer to which, Firſt, we know very well, that the Church of *Rome* does always accommodate her Allowing and Condemning of Books to the Circumſtances of her preſent condition; and as Princes are ſometimes forc'd by the neceſſity of their Affairs to diſavow the Actions of their Miniſters, though done by their moſt expreſſe Command; ſo is this intereſted Church frequently reduc'd to connive at Books which ſhe does by no means like, and to Cenſure others which ſhe does not only approve, but (under-hand) directs. A good inſtance of this we have in the caſe of *Sanctarellus*'s Book (one of thoſe he mentions) which though at firſt Printed by the Approbation and ſpecial Licenſe of * *Mutius Vittelleſcus*, then General of the Jeſuits, and by the Order of the Maſter of the Popes Palace; yet when the Pope found it would not be endur'd in *France*, but that both the *Sorbonne* had condemn'd it, and the Parliament of *Paris* had order'd it to be burnt, he thought fit (after it had been out ſo long, that the Copies were almoſt all bought up) to forbid the Sale of it at *Rome*, but without any manner of Cenſure, either upon the Author or Doctrine, * which is generally their way of condemning theſe kind of Books, when Civil Conſiderations at laſt oblige them to it, *viz.* a bare prohibition of them, after every body has read them that cares for them. Such a Condemnation as this did *Mariana* meet with in *Spain*; and of

* *Compend. pag.* 78.

* *See* Sanctarellus *himſelf.*

* *See more of this in the Preface to the Jeſuits Loyalty.*

of this gentle nature was *Becanus's* Correction at *Rome*, not for the Doctrines he maintain'd, but for Overlashing, (as Bishop *Montague* expresses it in his Preface to King *James's* Works) *i. e.* for speaking the mind of their Church more plainly than was at that time convenient. For, Secondly, we know well enough that these Principles of *Deposing and Killing Kings, and Extirpating Hereticks*, are thought too precious Truths, and too high Points to be ordinarily expos'd to the Vulgar, and press'd upon all Occasions; that they are the *Arcana Imperii* of their Kingdom of Darkness, and kept like Warrants Dormant among the *Cabala* of their wicked Mysteries, to justifie Rebellions, Assassinates, and Massacres, when the Church has very great need of them, and finds it her Interest to own these *Doctrines of Devils*; at other times it may suit better with her Designs to preach up Loyalty and Obedience to Princes, and universal Charity to Mankind. Lastly, we know that the *Venetians* and the *French* have been always Opposers of the Pope's Encroachments upon civil Sovereigns, and that they do not submit to these sort of Doctrines, which are so directly calculated for his attaining an Absolute Dominion over the Christian World, a long projected *Fifth Monarchy*, at least in the same degree, that other Countries which are more Jesuited and enslav'd to the Pope, are forc'd to do; which by the way may serve for a good Argument to convince them of Differences among themselves, and overthrow their glorious pretence of Union, which they do so magnifie upon all occasions to our reproach, but cannot signifie any thing to the purpose, for which the *Compendianist* here intends it, *viz.* to shew the Bishop of *Lincoln*, in Answer to his Challenge at the end of his Book, *That the Church of* Rome *has by publick Acts and Declarations disown'd and condemn'd those Principles which His Lordship charges upon her.* He very confidently indeed affirms, that the Censures of those Authors he mentions *p.* 78. *l.* 32. are such. But what? does he hope by positiveness to face us down, that the *Venetians* and the *French* are the *Roman* Church? Or that the Universities of *France* and the Parliament of *Paris* are her Representatives? Is it possible he should believe we have not Logick enough to distinguish between the Parts and Branches of a Church, and the Church her

ſelf in her publick Authority and Repreſentations? Does he indeed imagine, that he can at this time of day make the Judgments of particular Univerſities and Civil Aſſemblies paſſe upon us for publick Acts and Declarations of the Church of *Rome*? He muſt needs pardon us; we have been too often told it upon other occaſions; to be ignorant now, that nothing but the Decrees of a Pope or a General Council are the publick Acts and Declarations of the Church of *Rome*; and he has not ſo much as pretended to ſhew either of theſe, for the Condemnation of thoſe Principles which the Biſhop has prov'd upon his Religion by both. What ſcorn then can be vile enough to throw upon his impudent Claim of the Biſhop's conditional promiſe of turning *Papiſt*, when the termes upon which that promiſe was given are ſo far from being made good? And why does he run over ſuch a Bead-role of names —— *The Colledge of the Sorbonne, Paris, Caen, Rheimes*, &c. I ſay to what end does he ſtun us with this vaſt Din of inſignificant Words, and rattle in our ears with empty Sounds?

I thought to have paſs'd by his Quibble upon the Biſhop's Title, 'tis ſo very ſenceleſſe and thin a conceit; but becauſe I find he is apt to think every thing unanſwerable that is not particularly taken notice of, I ſhall do him the favour to make the Reader obſerve this ridiculous Criticiſm: *Who could think* (ſays* he) *that His Lordſhips Heat againſt us ſhould force him even to a Title that has confuted his whole Book*, viz. *That Popiſh Principles and Poſitions (when really believ'd) are deſtructive and dangerous to all Kings, eſpecially Proteſtants; for he cannot term them Principles of Faith, becauſe they were never thus Believ'd, &c.* I ſuppoſe by *Principles of Faith* here, he means what is commonly underſtood by *Articles of Faith, i. e.* Points neceſſary to Salvation; for the words are equivocal, and may bear ſeveral ſences: but becauſe this is moſt favourable to his Objection, I ſhall underſtand them ſo. Now why cannot the Biſhop term theſe Poſitions *Principles of Faith*? He has prov'd them to have been decreed both by Popes and Councils; and if that be not enough to make any Point a *Principle of Faith* in their Church

* Compend. pag. 76.

I

I know not where or how we ſhall find any *Principles of Faith* among them. He ſays indeed here (and in other places would inſinuate the ſame) *That they were never thus believ'd by any Catholick, nor never thus approv'd of by the Church.* But that's only his word againſt the Biſhop's Proof, and ſignifies nothing but to convince the World of the ſhameleſs Impudence of Popiſh Writers, who can even in Print, and in the face of a learned and inquiring People, affirm things contrary to direct Proofs, without ever ſo much as endeavouring to anſwer thoſe Proofs. I ſee no reaſon therefore why the Biſhop might not have term'd them *Principles of Faith*, if he had pleas'd, but that it was not at all material to the deſign of his Diſcourſe ſo to do; 'twas enough for his purpoſe to prove them *Principles of their Religion*, (which he has moſt clearly done) no matter whether they hold them neceſſary to Salvation or not; their very holding them as *Principles of their Religion*, does make that ſufficiently dangerous to Princes, which was what the Biſhop undertook to ſhow. But let us ſuppoſe now, that the Biſhop cannot term theſe Poſitions *Principles of Faith*, I'le engage it ſhall do his Title no more hurt, than 'tis plain it would his Book; indeed neither of them any at all. *This Title* (ſays he) *That Popiſh Principles and Poſitions (when really believ'd) are deſtructive*, &c. *has confuted his whole Book.* Why? Becauſe he cannot term them (pray mark the Reaſon) *Principles of Faith*, &c. Can any unprejudic'd man now, whoſe Brains lie in their right place, perceive any ſort of Conſequence in this Argument? for my own part I can find none. But if there be any little ſence at the bottom of this awkard blunder, it muſt be this, *viz.* a ſuppoſal, that the real Belief of any *Principle of Religion* makes it immediately a *Principle of Faith*, (*i.e.* in his ſence of thoſe Terms, a point neceſſary to Salvation) though it was not ſo before: which is certainly the moſt extravagant Whimſey that ever got hold of any mans Imagination, but our confus'd *Compendianiſts*; and if this be not his meaning, he talks *Wild Iriſh*, and is utterly unintelligible. I think I need not go about to confute ſuch ſelf-evident Foolery as this; the very Offer were an affront to the meaneſt Readers Underſtanding; there's hardly a School-boy, but knows that

Christian Religion teaches many useful and true Doctrines, which are not necessary to Salvation, that yet are really believ'd by all those that are really of the Christian Religion. The Bishop's Title therefore is very proper, and very consistent with the design of his Book, and this man's exception to it most absurd and frivolous. 'Tis indeed not only proper, but charitable and modest; it implies the Bishop does not believe, that all who live in the external Communion of the Church of *Rome*, are either so disloyal to their Prince, or so unmerciful to their Friends and Neighbours, as those Doctrines he charges upon her, really and heartily assented to, must needs make them. He hopes possibly, that Humane Nature it self in some may check at their harshness and a particular sweetness of temper in others, very much allay the Malignancy of their Poyson, and hinder them from having their full effect upon the Understanding, at least such an effect as is justly to be dreaded from them, when they seize upon the minds of Melancholy Recluses, or sink deep into the affections of her ignorant hot-headed Devoto's, those Christian * *Faquirs*.

* *A Sect of Religious Murderers among the* Turks. *See an Account of them in* Tavernier's *Six Voyages*, pag. 199.

For the Promise he makes us at last, in imitation of the Bishop's, † **That he himself will turn Protestant**, *if the Bishop shews him but one single Paragraph in all his Book, in relation to their dangerous Principles that he has not fully answer'd*, &c. I will be so civil to him at parting, to let him know he need not be in any pain about it; for though the Condition of his Obligation be not in the least measure, nor is ever likely to be perform'd, yet I can assure him there's no body intends to take any advantage of the Forfeiture. Though he has been so far from answering every single Paragraph of the Bishop's Book, that he has not in truth answer'd one single word of it to any purpose, as I have already shew'd him; yet we will not be so unmercifully rigorous to require a Person of his Form of Parts to turn Protestant, and force him to be a reasonable man, and a good Christian against his Conscience; no, no, let him stay where

† Compend. pag. 79.

where he is; we are not at all fond of his Company, and the Religion he has will beſt ſuit with his Wit.

His little Stocke of Common Place Arguments being now ſpent, he is at laſt reduc'd to Story telling, and the concluſion of his looſe Ramble in this Paragraph againſt the Biſhop is an incredible ſcandalous Tale about a Friend of his, and Doctor *Taylor*, by which he repreſents that late famous and worthy Divine, not only as a Papiſt but a Knave, and implicitely throws the ſame dirt upon the Biſhop; maliciouſly inſinuating as if neither of them believ'd their own Books. His words are theſe; *To conclude* (ſays He) *let me once more reminde his Lordſhip of his Promiſe, and then tell him (for I know he is a man of Parts) what Dr.* Taylor *ſaid to a Friend of mine concerning his Diſſuaſive from Popery*, viz. *That though 'twere lik'd, yet 'twas but turning the Tables, and he could write a Book twice as good.* This Story has the very complexion of a *Popiſh* Lye, all the Lineaments and Features of a Jeſuitical Slander, 'tis a known Artifice of the *Romiſh* Agents, when they cannot deal with their Adverſaries Reaſons, to aſſault their Reputations by all kind of unjuſt Calumnies, and impudent Forgeries; and finding that the abſurdneſs of their Tenets cannot be diſguis'd to men, who have the uſe of their Faculties, their deſpaire to proſelyte the Living, ſends them among the Charnel Houſes to make Converts of the dead. This is a trick they have perpetually put upon us ever ſince the Reformation; all Proteſtants of any note who dye either in their Acquaintance or Neighbourhood are ſure to be of their Faith after their Deaths, though all their lives they abhorr'd it? the Dead are as conſtantly reported theirs, as if they had been Baptis'd in their Names, according to the cuſtome of the Primitive *Corinthians*, or as if they were to be reckon'd natural Eſcheats to that *Church*, which (contrary to the Scripture) prays for them; and moſt commonly the dying too, when they are no longer able to contradict their whiſpers, are hook'd within the Toyls of their *Univerſality*; no ſooner does a man's Reaſon and his Sence begin to leave him, but preſently the Catholick Religion lays claim to him; and indeed he is then moſt fit for that Communion, and a proper Tool for Prieſts,

Prieſts and Jeſuites to work their ends by, and Sanctify'd Rogues to make their Markets of. *Whereſoever the Carcaſe is, there will theſe* Roman *Eagles be gathered together for their Prey.* Proteſtants cannot dye quietly in their Beds, nor ſo much as reſt in their Graves for the unwearied practiſes of the Popes Emiſſaries, and the endleſs Perſecution of their falſe Tongues, who think it meritorious to Lie for the Propagation of their Faith, and a piece of Godly Zeal to defame their Neighbours for the Honour of their Church. But this is one of the ſmall Games their ill ſucceſſe has forc'd them to play at, rather than ſtick out, a deſpicable ſhift to keep up ſome little reſt of Credit to their baffled Cauſe; and would they obſerve any ſort of Bounds in the Spoyl and Havock they make of mens good Names, and their Invaſions of the beſt and moſt laſting Property of Mankind in their Unchriſtian Violations of the Honour of the *Dead*; Would theſe lawleſſe Church Corſairs, theſe deſperate Picaroons for Popery, robbe with modeſty, and be ſatisfy'd with making private men their Prize, we ſhould perhaps content our ſelves to deſpiſe their little Pyracies, and laugh at their feeble Inroades. But when they endeavour to ſink our ſtrongeſt Men of War, and take our very Admirals in the Port; when they will needs have our chief Leaders to be their Followers, and our moſt famous Champions at the Wheels of their Triumphal Chariots, when like the *Tartar's Scotch* Captive, they will pretend to hold their Goalers Priſoners, and erect their ridiculous Trophies upon the Tombes of their Conquerours. When nothing will ſerve their turns but that *Chillingworth* himſelf muſt be believ'd to dye a Papiſt, and Biſhop *King* to be reconcil'd to their Church in *Articulo mortis*; when Dr. *Taylor* muſt now after his Death be thought a Friend to Popery, who in his life was both an Honour and a Defence to the Proteſtant Faith, their impudence is intollerable, and their Lyes grow miſchievous; 'tis then neceſſary to expoſe the folly of their vain Pretences, and warne the people of their large Diſpenſations.

I ſhall now appeale to the Judgement of any unprejudic'd man, who has read Dr. *Taylors Diſſuaſive from Popery*, and if he

he thinks there is the leaſt probability that the Author of that excellent Book ſhould ſay he could write one twice as good againſt Proteſtants, or indeed any poſſibility that either He, or any man elſe, though never ſo willing, ſhould be able to do it. I will hereafter believe that Jeſuites can ſpeak Truth, and that Popiſh Controvertiſts may be ſometimes in the right, Dr. *Taylors* Relations, and thoſe who did particularly know him (which I had not the happineſs to do, otherwiſe than by his Reputation and his Writings) are able; without doubt, to ſay much more upon this Subject than I can pretend to, and I queſtion not but ſome of them will take care in convenient time to vindicate his Memory from ſoe foule a ſcandall as that of being a conceal'd Papiſt, and of Writing what he did not think. I ſhall therefore leave it to them, whoſe proper concern it is, not having at preſent the means to make any enquiry my ſelfe into the buſineſſe. In the mean time let us ſuppoſe this Story to be true, which, according to all appearance is next to impoſſible, what is here pretended to have been ſaid by Dr. *Taylor*, was I perceive, a thing ſaid in private converſation, and probably, in great truſt and confidence of the perſon to whom 'twas ſpoke; How to Print this to the World, with Deſign to blaſt the Reputation of a Divine, after his Death, is ſuch a piece of honeſty and good nature, as is no where to be met with, but in the Moralls of a Jeſuite, and the Chriſtianity of a *Romiſh* Zealot.

For what is intended in this malicious Paſſage to reflect on the Biſhop of *Lincolne*, as if he were as bad a Hypocrite, as Dr. *Taylor* is here repreſented to have been, and could have writ (if he had pleas'd) a better Book on the Papiſts ſide, 'tis ſo witleſs a Libel, ſuch ſilly Slander, that I think there is no need of anſwering it to any, who have ever heard of his great Name, and he muſt have liv'd very remote from Company, who is in *England* a Stranger to that. His Life is a ſufficient proof of the honeſty of his Writings, and a full confutation of this, and all other Lyes, which the Inſtruments of *Rome* or Hell can invent to aſperſe him; in vain do they think to anſwer him, as they have done other men, by reflections on his Perſon,

ſon, and to overthrow his Reaſons by ridiculous Stories, and abſurd *Romance*: theſe *Argumenta ad Hominem*, which are uſually their beſt Refuge, will miſerably fail them here? they look like the frettings of a gaul'd Faction, and do but betray an impotent Spite; the Biſhop of *Lincolne*'s Honour is as much above the reach of their malice, as their deſerts, and they may then hope to make the World think ill of him when they can ſo far cozen it as to be thought well off themſelves. 'Tis true his Abilities are extraordinary enough to recommend almoſt any thing he would appear for, though never ſo unreaſonable, and no doubt, he knows how to write Sophiſtries as well as to confute them; but we are ſatisfyed his Piety will no more ſuffer him to plead a bad Cauſe than his Learning will let him prejudice a good one. Beſides, let them not flatter themſelves, the Knavery of theirs is now ſo palpably obvious, their Religion has, by long and conſtant delays, grown ſo monſtrouſly deform'd, it has at laſt out-liv'd the help of Art. The Writings of their beſt Witts, and their moſt eminent Scholars have, in my Opinion, done it more hurt than good; when they have adorn'd it all they can with ſtrain'd pieces of Rhetorick out of the Fathers, and daub'd it as much as poſſible with the forc'd Flatteries of Councils; when they have ſet it forth in the ſpecious colours of pretended Union and Univerſality, and cover'd it all over with School-Diſtinctions, what can an indifferent man conclude but that ſuch vaſt paines would not, nor need not be taken, except it were to hide ſome notorious Defects; ſuch extream ſtudyed Ornaments are evident proofes of great want of natural Beauty: in a word, this Spiritual Whore does but appeare the more Trumpet through the groſſe Artifice of her Dreſs, and the thickneſs of her Paint.

delayes

I have now done with the Compendiatiſt, and ſhall enlarge this Diſcourſe no farther but to joyn with all good *Engliſh men* in offering up my hearty prayers to God Almighty, that He would ſtill preſerve the Proteſtant Religion among us, and continue to render fruitleſſe the contrary Endeavours and Contrivances of *wicked and unreaſonable Men*; fallacious Writers, and Traiterous Plotters; that He would keep the moſt knowing, and beſt

beſt civiliz'd Nation in the World from falling again under the *Barbariſm of Popery*, from being Oppreſt by the Tyranny, and cumber'd with the Weight of this huge unweildy Maſs of Non-ſenſe, and Puppetry. This farce of Ceremonies, this Counterfeit Chriſtianity, this Enemy to true Learning, and free Philoſophy; this Diſcourager of Trade and uſefull Induſtry, this Troubler of agreeable Converſation, and reaſonable Living, this Prohibiter of good Senſe, and this Extinguiſher of good Nature; in a word this Un-Chriſtian, and this Immoral Religion, or rather this new Species of Irreligion, which by her Doctrines of diſpenſing with Oaths, and abſolving from all manner of Crimes upon ſlight and ridiculous Penances, as well as by thoſe the Biſhop of *Lincoln* has convinc'd her of, has not only overthrown the Foundations of real Goodneſſe and true Piety, but even of neceſſary Faith, and common Honeſty, looſening the very Bands and Ligaments, and undermining the Props of Civil Communities.

FINIS.